

CREATING INCLUSIVE ORGANIZATIONS

One Student Affairs Division's Efforts to Create Sustainable, Systemic Change

Kathy Obear and Shelly Kerr

Introduction

Most U.S. colleges and universities continue to experience increasing student diversity (Harper, 2008; Manning & Muñoz, 2011; Talbot, 2003), while also facing intensifying pressure to improve the academic success, persistence, and graduation of all students. Additionally, employers demand that students graduate with the skills and competencies to be successful leaders in increasingly diverse, global environments (Hart Research Associates, 2010; Hart Research Associates, 2013; Williams, 2013). To meet these challenges, colleges and universities must be better prepared to respond to the needs of all students across the full range of intersecting group identities (Talbot, 2003). Unfortunately, many campuses appear to fall short of this goal as campus cultures and climates continue to be unwelcoming and “chilly,” (Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Nora, & Terenzini, 1999) if not hostile, to members of historically underrepresented and underserved groups. In addition, too many students across all group identities do not yet fully demonstrate the depth of critical thinking, perspective taking, and multicultural competence required to work effectively on diverse teams that serve the increasingly diverse domestic and global populations.

The unexamined beliefs, norms, and preferences of privileged groups have become systemically, often unconsciously, embedded in daily policies, practices, and services in many student affairs divisions resulting in the privileging of dominant group members, the perpetuation of inequity, and the reproduction of oppression (Harper & Antonio, 2008; Manning & Muñoz, 2011; Strange & Stewart, 2011). Campus change efforts have focused primarily on individual development through skill building and consciousness-raising activities. This focus on the individual tends to restrict these efforts to micro-level change (Pope & LePeau, 2012), and is an example of the “diversity as social good” approach which requires only a surface understanding and examination of systemic oppression (Watt, 2011). Whereas these efforts are necessary, they are not sufficient to create and sustain inclusive campus environments that advance the academic success of all students (Jackson, 2005; Jackson & Hardiman, 1994; Marchesani & Jackson, 2005). Increasing compositional diversity does not necessarily result in the necessary organizational culture change (Stewart, 2011). It reflects a sort of “magical thinking” on the part of participants (Chang, Chang, & Ledesma, 2005), a belief that the current campus climate and structures will support the academic success of the increasingly diverse student body without significant, systemic efforts to address the persistent, pervasive discrimination, alienation, and exclusion many members of marginalized groups experience on campus. It is imperative that all student affairs professionals develop the capacity and competence to lead macro-level organizational change efforts (Pope & LePeau, 2012). These efforts must address not only the systemic sources of inequity and oppression (Watt, 2011), but also transform organizational policies, practices, programs, and services to be fully responsive to the needs of all students across multiple, intersecting group identities (Manning & Muñoz, 2011).

What is an Inclusive Campus?

It is important that campus leaders develop a clear, shared understanding of what both diversity and inclusion mean for their specific organization. The authors define an *Inclusive Organization* as one where students, staff, and faculty feel welcomed and affirmed for who they are across the full breadth of their multiple, intersecting group identities, including: age; race; ethnicity; nationality; English proficiency; gender identity and expression; ability; socio-economic class; generation to college; sexual identity; religion, spirituality, and ways of knowing; parental and relational status; and veteran status, among others. On an inclusive campus, all members are treated with fairness, respect, and dignity. There is a consistent effort to eliminate

all barriers and forms of discrimination or negative differential treatment. Members of an inclusive organization experience a sense of belonging and mattering as full participants who are actively engaged in the campus community and are able to contribute to the success of the organization. They flourish and thrive in this environment where there is full access and equity for all as well as support to develop their full potential. Inclusive organizations actively seek out and value students, staff, and faculty who bring differing perspectives, life experiences, and group identities to the community. They leverage the wisdom and diversity of worldviews, talents, and competencies as a resource to prepare students for effective service and success in an increasingly diverse, global society. All members of an inclusive organization are responsible for revising policies, practices, curricula, programs, and services to align with the organizational mission and vision for inclusion and social justice (Cox, 2001; Elliott et al., 2013; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1999; Jackson, 2005; Jackson & Hardiman, 1994; Marchesani & Jackson, 2005; Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004; Williams, 2013).

Multicultural Organization Development (MCOD)

The Multicultural Organizational Development (MCOD) model developed by Bailey Jackson and Rita Hardiman provides a useful framework for designing and implementing long-term culture change efforts to create sustainable, meaningful inclusion for the full breadth of students on campus (Jackson, 2005; Jackson & Hardiman, 1994; Jackson & Holvino, 1988a; Marchesani & Jackson, 2005; Pope, 1993). Most campuses appear to have a haphazard, unplanned, and incremental approach to change, one that is often hastily constructed in reaction to the latest crisis or critical incident (Harper, 2011; Marchesani & Jackson, 2005; William, 2013). In contrast, the MCOD model provides a roadmap for developing an intentional, proactive “change process that involves all parts of the campus working towards eliminating barriers to full inclusion and creating pathways of success for all” (Marchesani & Jackson, 2005, p. 243). MCOD offers a process that first assesses the current culture, norms, policies, programs, priorities, and services in order to identify any structural inequalities where unintended bias or negative differential treatment occurs. MCOD then revises these, as needed, to “interrupt the usual” (Petitt & McIntosh, 2011, p. 201), and transform traditional campus culture and practices to support the academic success of the full breadth of students on campus (Manning & Muñoz, 2011; Watt, 2011).

What is the Purpose of Multicultural Organizational Change Efforts?

The goal of MCOD change efforts is to transform the overall organization so that equity and inclusion are a “central and integrative dimension” (Watt, 2011, p. 132), and viewed as fundamental to achieving the mission, vision, and values of the organization (Watt, 2011; Williams, 2013). This requires weaving equity and inclusion into every aspect of student affairs practice (Grieger, 1996; Manning & Muñoz, 2011; Pope et al., 2004; Williams, 2013). The goal of institutional transformation necessitates a shift from an “additive to an integrated approach” (Manning & Muñoz, 2011, p. 297), one that requires all units and offices to develop the capacity and structures to serve effectively all students across all group identities.

A Multicultural Organization (MCO) is “a system that seeks to improve itself and/or enhance its ability to reach its mission by advocating and practicing social justice and social diversity internally and external to the educational system” (Jackson, 2005, p. 7). The MCOD model is based on several key assumptions: oppression is systemic and entrenched in U.S. organizations; systems, not just individuals, must be the focus of change; and a multi-facet approach is required that both increases social diversity, creating a balanced demographic representation throughout the organization, as well as eliminates discrimination and social injustices (Jackson & Hardiman, 1994).

MCOD Development Stage Model

The MCOD Development Stage Model provides a developmental continuum of six stages that describes organizational states as they transform from a monocultural, exclusionary organization to a multicultural, inclusive organization (Jackson, 2005). It is important that leaders and staff develop a shared, comprehensive understanding of the stage(s) that best reflects the current state of the organization and each department so that they can collaboratively develop a change plan based upon an accurate diagnosis to move the organization toward the next stage of development (Jackson, 2005; Jackson & Hardiman, 1994).

The model is divided into three levels: Monocultural, Non-Discriminating, and Multicultural (Jackson, 2005; Jackson & Holvino, 1988b), with two stages at each level. Each of the six stages describes “the consciousness and culture of an organization with regard to issues of social justice and diversity and where the organization is relative to becoming an MCO” (Jackson, 2005, p. 144).

In Monocultural Organizations, leaders have no interest in becoming a Multicultural Organization (MCO) and focus on maintaining the privilege and access of those who have traditionally held power (Jackson & Holvino, 1988b).

- Stage 1, The Exclusionary Organization, openly maintains the power and dominance of members of privileged groups, and members of marginalized groups experience hostility and harassment.
- Stage 2, The Club Organization, stops short of explicitly excluding members of marginalized groups, but intentionally works to maintain the policies, norms, and practices that reinforce privilege of members of dominant groups (Jackson, 2005).

In Non-Discriminating Organizations, there is interest in bringing in members of marginalized groups so long as there is no change to the organizational culture and status quo (Jackson & Holvino, 1988b).

- In Stage 3, The Compliance Organization, some members of marginalized groups are hired into the lower levels of organizations or as tokens within the management ranks. The intent is to comply with external regulations and pressures for reform, yet there is no effort to shift the organizational mission, practices, or culture.
- Stage 4, The Affirming Organization, actively recruits members of marginalized groups and is committed to eliminating discriminatory practices. Structures are created to support the development of members of marginalized groups and increase their mobility in the organization. Awareness workshops are offered to encourage all members to behave in non-oppressive ways; however, members of marginalized groups are expected to assimilate and fit into the organizational culture (Jackson & Holvino, 1988b).

In Multicultural Organizations the focus is to increase the diversity of representation throughout the organization, shift structures to create equitable distribution of power and influence, and eliminate inequity and oppression inside and outside the organization (Jackson & Holvino, 1988b).

- Stage 5, Redefining Organization, is committed to the full participation, empowerment, and inclusion of all members across identity groups. Focus is on developing the internal capacity of all members to create inclusive environments. Policies, practices, services, and cultural norms are reviewed, revised, and changed to align with the

organizational values and mission of inclusion and social justice (Jackson & Holvino, 1988b).

- Stage 6, The Multicultural Organization, is an aspirational stage and a vision for the organization to move toward (Jackson, 2005). In this ideal state all members are active participants in decisions and planning practices that impact the organization. The policies, programs, services, and culture are intentionally designed and continually revised to meet the needs of the increasingly diverse organizational membership and those they serve. The organization consistently acts on its commitment to eliminate oppression in all forms within the organization and in the local, regional, national, and global spheres.

The MCODE Change Process

Jackson (2006) identifies four components of the MCODE Process:

1. Identify change agents (leadership team and internal change team);
2. Assess organizational readiness to determine if there is sufficient leadership and internal capacity to develop a successful MCODE change process;
3. Assess the current state (culture, climate, and organizational structures); and
4. Develop and implement a continuous improvement change cycle of assessment, diagnosis, planning, implementation, accountability, and evaluation.

What Are the Roles of the Leadership Team and the Inclusion Change Team?

The Leadership Team performs several critical roles in the change process: providing the direction, vision, sense of urgency, and expectations for change; outlining how creating an inclusive organization is integral to the institutional mission and strategic plan; giving authority to the internal change team; and providing active support and leadership throughout the change process (Cox, 2001; Jackson, 2006; Williams, 2013). The Inclusion Change Team, comprising a cross-section of both formal and informal leaders from throughout the organization, is responsible for managing the MCODE change process (Jackson, 2006). Significant team building and competency development is required to support the success of the change team. Core competencies include systems thinking, change management, foundational concepts

and tools on inclusion and social justice, the MCO model and change process, and navigating group dynamics and conflict.

How Does the Leadership Team Work With the Members of the Inclusion Change Team?

The leaders and members of the inclusion change team work in partnership to accomplish several key steps in the change process: clarifying the organization's mission and vision of inclusion and social justice; conducting a comprehensive assessment of the current state including strengths, issues of concern, opportunities, and challenges; completing a gap analysis between the current stage of development and the ideal state of a Stage 6 MCO; and developing and implementing a change plan that is aligned with the developmental readiness of the organization to move the organization toward greater inclusion and social justice (Jackson, 2006).

Complete a Cultural Audit

The purpose of the assessment phase is to determine the current state, identify how far the organization has to move to become an MCO, and establish a benchmark to measure progress over time (Jackson, 2006; Marchesani & Jackson, 2005). Common assessment methods include surveys, interviews, focus groups, and cultural audits. Cultural audits involve analyzing organizational data from a wide variety of sources, including student and personnel demographics, climate and culture surveys, recruitment and retention practices, critical incidents and grievances, service and program utilization studies, and performance management processes. It is critical to disaggregate the data by social identity groups, hierarchical level/position type, and organizational unit.

Develop a Shared Understanding of the Current State

In the next step of the change process, the leaders work with the inclusion change team to review, discuss, and analyze the data as they develop a shared understanding of the current state of the organization (Jackson, 2006). An important change management strategy is to involve a wide cross-section of the organization in this process by providing open forums or large group working sessions to review and discuss the data, identify the current state and issues needing attention, explore implications and unanswered questions for further assessment, and identify potential activities and strategies for change. The outcome of these assessment steps helps build ownership of the data, provide support for the change effort, and engage any potential resistance that exists (Chesler, 1994; Marchesani & Jackson, 2005).

Develop a Change Plan

The next key step is for the leaders and the inclusion change team to develop a plan for creating a more inclusive, socially just organization. Key elements of the plan include: identifying and prioritizing the issues and situations to be addressed; developing observable, measurable goals that will move the organization toward greater inclusion; identifying specific activities designed to achieve these goals; developing an accountability system including assignments, criteria to measure progress, resources required, and timelines for completion; and developing strategies to share the plan and invite feedback from members of the organization (Jackson, 2006).

Review Current Policies, Programs, and Services With an Inclusion Lens

A critical component in the implementation of the change plan involves reviewing and revising the policies and daily practices of every aspect of the organization (Williams, 2013). This includes: the mission and values; personnel profile; policies and practices related to recruitment, retention, orientation, professional development, planning and decision-making, budget allocations, supervision, and performance management; the programs and services for students, staff, and faculty; teaching and learning methodologies and curricula; and the culture and climate of the organization (Jackson, 2005). The goal is to ensure that the divisional units provide meaningful and relevant programs and services to meet the needs and support the academic success of students across the full spectrum of group identities (Pope et al., 2004).

Implement an Accountability Structure

Too often organizations fail to create any significant, lasting change. The initial urgency to create greater inclusion tends to dissipate as leaders and members of the organization realize both the depth of dysfunction and the amount of time, resources, and attention required to create sustainable change. A meaningful system of ongoing accountability helps to offset this tendency. Without an explicit structure to hold people accountable, most organizations experience a “natural pull back towards the status quo” (Jackson, 2005, p. 7). Effective accountability structures include published plans that identify responsible parties and clear timelines, regular updates in meetings of the leadership and the inclusion change team; and quarterly open forums to discuss progress and next steps with the entire organization (Jackson, 2006).

Plan for Continuous Improvement

A final critical element of the MCOB Change Process is annual formal evaluation processes that provide indicators of progress and data to inform

ongoing assessment and planning processes (Jackson, 2005). It is important that both leaders and members of the organization shift the cultural norms to embrace continuous learning, reassessment, and recalibration as foundational principles and practices for creating inclusive organizations (Jackson, 2006; Jackson & Holvino, 1988b). Creating sustainable, meaningful organizational change is an “enduring pursuit” (Petitt & McIntosh, 2011, p. 204), and a demanding, ever-changing process (Chang, Milem, & antonio, 2011), requiring courage, stamina, patience, and persistent leadership to effectively navigate the inevitable shifting contexts, challenges, and circumstances that occur over time.

A Multi-Year Systemic Change Process in a Student Affairs Division

In 2008, The University of Oregon Division of Student Affairs completed a five-year strategic plan in which it identified the goal of becoming a multicultural organization. The vice president for student affairs created the MCO Implementation Team as an internal change team charged with identifying steps and strategies to achieve this divisional goal (Jackson, 2006). The MCO Implementation Team spent its first year researching MCO best practices, developing a simple and accessible definition of the Student Affairs multicultural organization, and writing a report to the vice president with initial perceptions and recommendations.

The MCO Implementation Team described the Division of Student Affairs Multicultural Organizational Development as “the intentional creation of an organization that actively includes and engages everyone” (p. xx). The Implementation Team identified the following characteristics for the division to aspire to (a) a dynamic and ongoing commitment to the MCO process; (b) creating a safe, welcoming, accessible, and fair environment; (c) advocating for social justice; (d) eliminating all forms of oppression; (e) having diverse representation throughout all levels of the division; (f) considering the multicultural impact in all decision-making processes; (g) understanding and engaging the advantages and strengths of a diverse organization; and (h) encouraging the contributions of all members of the division. The Team also reported on Student Affairs current multicultural efforts, MCO best practices gleaned from the literature, changes needed for the division to become a multicultural organization, and barriers to becoming an MCO.

The MCO Implementation Team developed a three-year action plan and implemented three key change strategies: (a) MCO team members collaborated with Student Affairs department directors to train unit leadership teams on the MCO model and key concepts; (b) Team members

integrated MCOD concepts into new employee orientation for unclassified and classified staff; and (c) the Team developed a plan for each unit to conduct a Cultural “Snapshot” to assess the department’s current state and areas for change.

Developing Internal Capacity of Division Leaders and Unit Change Teams

The MCOD Team hired an external consultant to facilitate a two-day Working Retreat to help increase internal capacity of leaders and staff to implement Cultural Audits and create inclusive organizations through long-term culture change. Because the word “audit” often connotes a negative experience, the Team used the phrase Cultural Snapshot instead of Cultural Audit. Each division leader attended the Retreat along with both formal and informal department leaders who reflected a “diagonal slice” of the unit and demonstrated a commitment to creating inclusion. These leaders and staff formed the nucleus of future Unit Inclusion Change Teams.

Intended Outcomes of the Working Retreat

The consultant designed learning activities to deepen the following competencies of participants: increasing clarity of the Leadership Team’s vision and expectations for culture change; developing a shared understanding of common terms and concepts; understanding the MCOD change process; exploring key components and tools to conduct an MCOD Cultural Snapshot at the unit and divisional level; identifying next steps to create Unit Change Teams that successfully complete a Cultural Snapshot and identify recommendations for change. During this highly engaging, interactive retreat the facilitator reviewed several key models and competencies, including: the MCOD Development Stage Model, Indicators of an Inclusive Organization, Multicultural Competencies for an Inclusive Organization, Discretionary Points Mapping, conducting a Cultural Snapshot/Audit, and Steps to Creating Organizational Change. In addition, participants experienced a wide variety of activities and tools they could use to train the members of their Unit Change Teams as they developed into high-performing teams. The retreat was successful in meeting its intended learning objectives and participant feedback was very positive.

Implementing a Cultural Snapshot

The MCOD Change Team developed and distributed a division-wide Cultural Snapshot survey based on the *Indicators of a Redefining/Multicultural Organization* (Obear, 2011). Each department then received data from the

survey in the form of a report that included department-specific information and division-wide information. Each Unit Change Team used this information, in conjunction with other forms of assessment, to begin to analyze the current state of equity and inclusion in the unit. Each Team submitted a report of their findings to the department director and the vice president for student affairs. The following are the indicators used in the Cultural Snapshot assessment:

- **Departmental Mission:** Values such as diversity, equity and inclusion are (a) very important to my department; and (b) are articulated as central to the mission and focus of my department.
- **Leadership** (director, associate, and assistant directors): Department leaders (a) demonstrate a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion; (b) develop and communicate a clear and concise list of multicultural competencies that all staff members are expected to demonstrate in their daily work; (c) expect me to include diversity, equity, and inclusion goals in my work; (d) ensure that there are safe, confidential processes for reporting and resolving grievances, harassment, etc.
- **Supervision:** Supervisors (a) regularly discuss their commitment to issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion with direct reports, individually and as a team; (b) regularly assess the progress of direct reports on their diversity, equity, and inclusion goals; (c) provide opportunities to staff to participate in activities related to diversity, equity, and inclusion; and (d) immediately respond to reports of inappropriate and/or offensive behaviors from staff in their department(s).
- **Planning and Decision-Making:** My department intentionally includes input from staff and students who are affected by the potential decisions and those who are involved in implementing the decisions.
- **Policies and Procedures:** My department (a) has created policies and procedures that reflect a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion; (b) has reviewed its policies and procedures to assess their impact on those from underrepresented groups; and (c) intentionally creates forms and applications that are culturally inclusive.
- **Staff Recruitment and Hiring:** My department (a) always incorporates language expressing a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in position/job descriptions; (b) always makes an effort to generate a diverse applicant pool for available positions; (c) always selects and interviews a diverse group of applicants; (d) has successfully hired staff from underrepresented identities; (e) requires that applicants

who will be hired by my department have a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion; and (f) follows processes for promotions and interim appointments that are transparent and aligned with diversity, equity, and inclusion goals.

- **Staff Orientation, Professional Development, and Retention:** My department (a) conducts orientation with new employees to review Division and Department priorities related to diversity, equity, and inclusion; and (b) has successfully retained staff from underrepresented identities; (c) ensures staff members from underrepresented identities receive mentoring, professional development opportunities, and professional and personal support in my department.
- **Physical Environment:** My department (a) displays physical artifacts (e.g., artwork reading materials, decorations, photographs) that represent a diversity of cultural perspectives; (b) displays announcements for diverse/culturally inclusive programs/events/services in our public spaces (e.g., bulletin boards); and (c) the physical spaces in my department take into consideration different abilities, sizes, and physical needs.
- **Marketing and Communication:** My department's (a) publications (e.g., handbooks, brochures, flyers, resource guides, and announcements) are culturally inclusive in their use of language, photographs, and graphics; (b) web spaces (e.g., departmental website, social networking sites, and links to outside sites) are culturally inclusive in their use of language, photographs, and graphics; and (c) values and terms such as diversity, equity, and inclusion are always included in my department's written and visual materials (e.g., brochures, advertisements, websites).
- **Research and Assessment:** My department collects, analyzes, and shares data about the work environment for staff related to issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Conducting a Gap Analysis and Developing Recommendations

Each department Inclusion Change Team analyzed the assessment information from the Cultural Snapshot to identify gaps between the current and desired state of the department, and then recommended strategies to achieve the desired state. Change Teams prioritized their recommendations and identified the strategies the department could commit to implement within the next 12–18 months. Inclusion Change Teams were required to submit brief progress reports to the MCOB Change Team at designated points in the process.

Next Steps in the MCOD Change Process

The MCOD Implementation Team intends to re-administer the division-wide Cultural Snapshot survey within a year of the completion of the initial Snapshot. Each department may decide to add new members to the Change Team to gain knowledge and expertise in Multicultural Organizational Development as well as keep several former members on the Team to ensure consistency. Each Unit Change Team will analyze new data, conduct another gap analysis, and identify the next steps to create greater inclusion in the department.

The Student Affairs MCOD Implementation Team identified additional activities in its most recent action plan, including (a) continuing to offer new employee orientation programs twice annually; (b) providing an opportunity for current Student Affairs staff members to learn more about the division's MCOD initiative and the new Student Affairs strategic plan; and (c) providing two staff development trainings each year focused on incorporating issues of equity and inclusion into functional aspects of job roles (e.g., recruitment and hiring, front line student service/customer service, marketing, manager/supervisor responsibilities).

Lessons Learned for Implementing a Change Process in Other Student Affairs Divisions

The following recommendations reflect the authors' lessons learned from using the MCOD Model on college and university campuses. These key insights may help campus leaders develop a campus change process tailored to their specific needs and organizational context.

- **Align divisional activities within a larger organizational change effort.** The impact of using MCOD to create greater inclusion in a division of student affairs will be far greater at both two- and four-year institutions if the process is situated within a comprehensive institution-wide change effort. Aligning divisional strategies with campus-wide initiatives will help leaders and staff members recognize their responsibility to infuse issues of equity and inclusion into policies, practices, services, and programs.
- **Provide leadership for the MCOD Change Process.** Some student affairs divisions may not have leaders with the capacity (skills, resources, time) to lead a division-wide systems change effort. It may be possible to adjust a leader's current portfolio to include a 25% focus on leading the MCOD effort. Another possibility is to

contract with external consultants to partner with internal leaders in this process.

- **Include at least one representative from each department on the Division's Change Team.** Departments without a representative on the Division's Team may have more difficulty understanding the purpose of, process for, and action steps toward developing a multicultural organization.
- **Develop a clear, written charge for Inclusion Change Teams.** Few division staff members may be familiar with the concept of an Inclusion Change Team. It is important to provide written structure regarding the composition, purpose, and scope of work to minimize confusion and time spent on activities not as relevant to the MCO process.
- **Provide opportunities for Inclusion Change Teams to interact with each other.** It is important to provide opportunities for collaboration, exchange of ideas, and sharing of successes and challenges. Without these opportunities, much of this work happens in isolation at the department level, even when reported up to division leadership. It may be useful to create a combined Change Team across 2–3 smaller units. These cross-unit teams may offer a number of advantages: increased relationship building and knowledge about other units; opportunity for innovative, collaborative initiatives; and increased support and accountability across units.
- **Provide frequent communication about the MCO process, deadlines, and expectations.** Regular, consistent communication will increase productivity and accountability throughout the organizational change process.

Conclusion

Manning and Muñoz (2011) argue that today's vision of educating the "whole student" necessitates a focus on issues of social justice, fairness, and equity. Student affairs practitioners need to increase their capacity to support students from underrepresented, marginalized groups while also equipping all students with the skills and competencies to be successful leaders in increasingly diverse, global environments (Harper, 2008; Harper & Antonio, 2008; Hurtado & Guillermo-Wann, 2013; Manning & Muñoz, 2011). Implementing a long-term systems change process in the division of student affairs demonstrates leadership in achieving the academic mission of the university, provides staff with professional development opportunities to deepen their multicultural competencies, and sets the expectation that all staff are

required to continually revise and improve policies, practices, programs, and services to create inclusive environments that support the academic success of the full breadth of students on campus.

References

- Chang, M. J., Chang, J., & Ledesma, M. C. (2005). Beyond magical thinking: Doing the real work of diversifying our institutions. *About Campus*, 10(2), 9–16.
- Chang, M. J., Milem, J. F., & Antonio, A. I. (2011). Campus climate and diversity. In J. H. Schuh, S. R. Jones, & S. R. Harper (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (5th ed.; pp. 43–58). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chesler, M. A. (1994). Organizational development is not the same as multicultural organizational development. In E. Y. Cross, J. H. Katz, F. A. Miller, & E. W. Seashore (Eds.), *The promise of diversity: Over 40 voices discuss strategies for eliminating discrimination in organizations* (pp. 240–251). Arlington, VA: NTL Institute.
- Cox, T. (2001). *Creating the multicultural organization: A strategy for capturing the power of diversity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Elliott, C. M., Stransky, O., Negron, R., Bowlby, M., Lickiss, J., Dutt, D., . . . Barbosa, P. (2013). Institutional barriers to diversity change work in higher education. *Sage Open*: doi: 10.1177/2158244013489686
- Grieger, I. (1996). A multicultural organizational development checklist for student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37, 561–573.
- Harper, S. R. (2008). *Creating inclusive campus environments for cross-cultural learning and student engagement*. Washington DC: NASPA.
- Harper, S. R. (2011). Strategy and intentionality in practice. In J. H. Schuh, S. R. Jones, & S. R. Harper (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (5th ed.; pp. 287–302). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harper, S. R., & Antonio, A. I. (2008). Not by accident: Intentionality in diversity, learning, and engagement. In S. R. Harper (Ed.), *Creating inclusive campus environments* (pp. 1–18). Washington DC: NASPA.
- Hart Research Associates. (2010). *Raising the bar: Employers' views on college learning in the wake of the economic downturn*. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/leap/documents/2009_EmployerSurvey.pdf
- Hart Research Associates. (2013). *It takes more than a major: Employer priorities for college learning and student success*. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities and Hart Research Associates. Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/leap/public_opinion_research.cfm
- Hurtado, S., & Guillermo-Wann, C. (2013). *Diverse learning environments: Assessing and creating conditions for student success—Final report to the Ford Foundation*. University of California—Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pederson, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial ethnic diversity*

- in higher education* (ASHE/ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 8). Washington DC: George Washington University.
- Jackson, B. W. (2005). The theory and practice of multicultural organizational development in education. In M. L. Ouellett (Ed.), *Teaching inclusively: Resources for course, department and institutional change in higher education* (pp. 3–20). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Jackson, B. W. (2006). Theory and practice of multicultural organization development. In B. B. Jones & M. Brazzel (Eds.), *The NTL handbook of organization development and change* (pp. 139–154). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.
- Jackson, B. W., & Hardiman, R. (1994). Multicultural organization development. In E. Y. Cross, J. H. Katz, F. A. Miller, & E. W. Seashore (Eds.), *The promise of diversity: Over 40 voices discuss strategies for eliminating discrimination in organizations* (pp. 231–239). Arlington, VA: NTL Institute.
- Jackson, B. W., & Holvino, E. V. (1988a, Fall). Developing multicultural organizations, *Journal of Religion and Applied Behavioral Science* (Association for Creative Change), 14–19.
- Jackson, B. W., & Holvino, E. V. (1988b). *Multicultural organizational development*. Working Paper No. 11. Ann Arbor, MI: Program on Conflict Management Alternatives.
- Manning, K., & Muñoz, F. M. (2011). Conclusion: Revisioning the future of multicultural students services. In D. L. Stewart (Ed.), *Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community* (pp. 282–299). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Marchesani, L. S., & Jackson, B. W. (2005). Transforming higher education institutions using multicultural organizational development: A case study at a large northeastern university. In M. L. Ouellett (Ed.), *Teaching inclusively: Resources for course, department and institutional change in higher education* (pp. 241–257). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Obear, K. (2011). *Indicators of a redefining/multicultural organization*. Paper presented at American College Personnel Association, Baltimore, MD.
- Petitt, B., & McIntosh, D. (2011). Negotiating purpose and context. In D. L. Stewart (Ed.), *Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community* (pp. 201–215). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Pope, R. L. (1993). Multicultural-organization development in student affairs: An introduction. *Journal of College Student Development*, 34, 201–205.
- Pope, R. L., & LePeau, L. A. (2012). The influence of institutional context and culture. In J. Arminio, V. Torres, & R. L. Pope (Eds.), *Why aren't we there yet? Taking personal responsibility for creating an inclusive campus* (pp. 103–130). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Pope, R. L., Reynolds, A. L., & Mueller, J. A. (2004). *Multicultural competence in student affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stewart, D. L. (2011). Introduction. In D. L. Stewart (Ed.), *Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community* (pp. 1–10). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

- Strange, C. C., & Stewart, D. L. (2011). Preparing diversity change leaders. In D. L. Stewart (Ed.), *Multicultural student services on campus: Building bridges, re-visioning community* (pp. 254–266). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Talbot, D. M. (2003). Multiculturalism. In S. R. Komives & D. B. Woodard (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed.; pp. 423–446). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Watt, S. K. (2011). Moving beyond the talk: From difficult dialogues to action. In J. Arminio, V. Torres, & R. Pope (Eds.), *Why aren't we there yet: Taking personal responsibility for creating an inclusive campus* (pp. 131–144). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., Nora, A., & Terenzini, P. T. (1999). Women's perceptions of a "chilly climate" and cognitive outcomes in college: Additional evidence. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(2), 163–177.
- Williams, D. A. (2013). *Strategic diversity leadership*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.